



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/784,227	02/13/2001	Scott Craig Koss	8371-123	2514	
20575 75	90 06/29/2004		EXAMINER		
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM PC 1030 SW MORRISON STREET			SORRELL, ERON J		
PORTLAND, (ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2182	<i></i>	
			DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004	\supset	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

	,			N		
•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	\mathcal{A}		
Office Action Summary		09/784,227	KOSS, SCOTT CRAIG	U		
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Eron J Sorrell	2182			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory prior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by steply received by the Office later than three months after the red patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may n. a reply within the statutory minimum of the crip will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mestatute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.		
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _					
′=	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction a ion Papers	ndrawn from consideration.				
_						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 February 2001</u> in Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the country the oath or declaration is objected to by the	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[o the drawing(s) be held in abey orrection is required if the drawi	vance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bushee the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received ir priority documents have be ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage			
2) Notice 3) Infor	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Sler No(s)/Mail Date 2 and 4.	Paper N	w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Art Unit: 2182

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1,2,5,8,9,10,12,13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,217 hereinafter Lahey).
- 3. Referring to method claim 1 and computer-readable medium claim 9, Lahey teaches a method for network document processing, the method comprising:
- a) activating an interface between a predetermined document
 processing device and a workstation (see lines 15-31 of column
 7);
- b) providing at least one user interface to a user at the workstation, wherein the interface allows the user to select

Art Unit: 2182

operational settings for the predetermined document processing device (see lines 15-31 of column 7);

- c) generating a document data file (see lines 15-31 of column 7); and
- d) communicating a location of the document data file and any auxiliary information to the predetermined document processing device, thereby activating a document processing job to be executed in accordance with any operational settings selected by the user (see lines 22-27 of column 6).
- 4. Referring to claim 2, Lahey teaches activating an interface further comprises launching a document processing client in response to a document processing request by the user (see lines 15-31 of column 7).
- 5. Referring to claim 5, Lahey teaches generating a document data file further comprises storing the document data file on a job file store (see lines 30-37 of column 12).
- 6. Referring to method claim 8 and system claim 17, Lahey teaches the document processing device is one of the group comprising: a printer, a fax machine, a multi-function peripheral, an electronic document management system, a plotter,

Art Unit: 2182

a network fax machine, a language translation server and a knowledge management system (see item labeled 31 in figure 1 and paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5).

- 7. Referring to claim 10, Lahey discloses an software application for print processing (see lines 15-31 of column 7). This program is fully capable of being downloaded.
- 8. Referring to claim 12, Lahey teaches a network document processing system, comprising:
- a) a generic document processing client installed on at least one workstation connected to a network, wherein the document processing client is operable to interact with several different types of document processing devices (see lines 15-31 of column 7);
- b) a job file store, operable to receive document data files generated by the document processing client (see lines 31-37 of column 12); and
- c) at least one document-processing device, operable to receive a location of the document data files and auxiliary information associated with each document data file from the document-processing client (see lines 7-18 of column 5).

Art Unit: 2182

9. Referring to claim 13, Lahey teaches the documentprocessing client is one of the group comprised of: a printer
client, a fax client, an electronic document management system
client, a language translation client, and a knowledge system
management client (see lines 15-31 of column 7).

10. Referring to claims 15 and 16, Lahey discloses the job file is located on another device in the network and the job file store is a dedicated device (see lines 31-37 of column 12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 12. Claims 3,4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Yokoyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,166,826).

Art Unit: 2182

13. Referring to claims 3 and 4, Lahey fails to teach activating an interface further comprises launching and retrieving web pages to display capabilities of the predetermined document processing device.

Yokoyama teaches, in an analogous system, activating an interface further comprises launching and retrieving web pages to display capabilities of the predetermined document processing device, wherein the user interface is a web page (see lines 29-37 of column 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Yokoyama. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to make such modification in order to be able to access the desired information with any computer with access to the internet.

14. Referring to claim 7, Lahey teaches the auxiliary information includes the operational settings specified by the user (see lines 25-27 of column 6), however Lahey fails to explicitly set forth the limitation that the auxiliary information includes the size of the file.

Art Unit: 2182

Yokoyama teaches, in an analogous system, the auxiliary information including the size of the file (see lines 20-25 of column 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Yokoyama. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order to be able to select files to be printed based on the files attribute information as suggested by Yokoyama (see lines 26-37 of column 3).

- 15. Claims 6,11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Shima (U.S. Patent No. 6,552,816).
- 16. Referring to claim 6, Lahey fails to teach communicating a location further comprises sending a Uniform Resource Locator to the predetermined document-processing device.

Shima teaches, in an analogous system, communicating a location further comprises sending a Uniform Resource Locator to the predetermined document-processing device (see lines 19-40 of column 5).

Art Unit: 2182

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order for the printer to be able to print documents from any computer with access to the internet.

17. Referring to clam 11, Lahey fails to teach the computerreadable medium is a generic printer driver installed on each workstation of a network.

Shima teaches the computer-readable medium is a generic printer driver installed on each workstation of a network (see lines 37-59 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the computer-readable medium of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima in order for to allow for each computer on the network to print to the network printer.

18. Referring to claim 14, Lahey fails to teach the job file store is located on the workstation upon which is installed the document processing client.

Art Unit: 2182

Shima teaches the job file store is located on the workstation upon which is installed the document processing client (see lines 37-59 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to make such modification in order for documents on the workstations hard disk can be printed.

Conclusion

- 19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following references have been cited to further show the state of the art as it pertains to network printing:
- U.S. Patent No. 6,184,996 to Gase teaches sending print requests over the internet;
- U.S. Patent No. 6,240,456 to Teng teaches accessing printer status information over the internet.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eron J

Art Unit: 2182

Sorrell whose telephone number is 703 305-7800. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on 703 308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

EJS June 23, 2004